

240-27 Caney Road
Rosedale, N.Y. 11422

January 27, 1999

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Director of Patent Examining Groups
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Petition for a Make Special (R-3) under the Infringement Provisions
In Re: Application Serial # 09/135,504 Filing Date: 06/22/98
Title: Integrated Car Dubbing System Inventor: Phillip Igbinadolor

Sir/Madam:

I respectfully wish to file this petition for a make special new application for a utility patent based on the infringement rules under CFR regulations and CFR 1.17(i) fee duly paid in money order.

This petition, in part, provides answers of the verifiable statements of an actual infringement of my ideas and invention under the intellectual property rights provision act. Evidence of an infringement can be detected from the chronology of events, statements, and actions between me and the concerned parties relating to my invention at a given period of time.

My product invention consists of series of integrated technology and it is the first ever registered and patented car electronics that uses satellite, and or wireless technology with an applied software programming processes back by a special ICDS dual purpose disc. The distinctive nature of the new car sound system is its forty-two functional features detailed in my claim sheet for utility patent and prior arts claimed on my design patent. The electronic functional features of infringement in question are also technically and engineering detailed on all six pages of prior art works and drawings submitted for the design patent which were also filed with the utility patent application. The utility application of my invention is also practicable for home and commercial purposes.

I've attached a hard cover copy dated proof of my invention as disclosed long before any one or company knew of the ideas of infringement in question: Commercial Sensor break, internet/web in home/car/commercial electronics and personal computer adaptability in a car (my idea mainly eliminates bulky computer hardware and integrate it into an electronic cyber and entertainment surfing consumer product.

My idea and product invention were first disclosed to Mr. R. Ronaldo in 1995 and he was the first person to know of these ideas apart from me. Subsequent disclosure were made to Ms. Denise Benevento and later

02/03/2000 AL 00000001 0913304

the Board Drafting, Inc based in Florida.

Documents pertaining and relating to my invention and dates of disclosure are also submitted as proofs of my rights to prior arts. Unaware my ideas and invention are no longer confidential, I was told that the engineering company - Above the Board Drafting could not come up with a utility patent application as promised, even though detail and numerous pages of technical descriptions and drawings were sent. There was a breach of contract, however, the relevance of these verifiable statements is that both companies compromised, leaked, and perhaps sold my ideas to some manufacturing companies in the electronic industry. Chronology of events would help explain why I have concluded that an actual infringement of my ideas and invention had occurred.


In December, 1997, I saw on a QVC station (channel 79), a television station in New York that introduces and sells new products an idea in question PhilipsMagnavox had added to its existing product line. Also, in January, 1998 I noted that the same company has added a web feature on its existing television product line. A month later, on February 22, 1998 I also noted on the QVC station that JVC had added a commercial skip feature to its already existing vcr product. Just recently, I noted that Clarrion, an electronic manufacturer had added internet and pc in a car electronics. What do these companies have in common? They are feeding on my ideas which were disclosed in 1995. It doesn't take much to conclude that why didn't the companies featured these ideas before 1995 or before September 18, 1997 The reason is because I've been cheated out of my invention. I was told that the engeneering company - Above the Board Drafting could not come up with a utility patent application. They waited till I submit a forced upon (go along with the design patent application or you loose your money) application before these manufacturers rush into making the ideas.

If they knew of the ideas before 1995 or 1997 why didn't they incorporate them sooner or file a patent claim as I have done. I've been granted a design patent on my invention on July 7, 1998. The utility patent application filed June 22, 1998 was done by me and it is the continuation version of the design patent # 395,884.

Your approval of this petition would help in considering my new application sooner and an hedge on the current industrial and intellectual espionage which is rampant in the United States and as a common practice worldwide. Small entity inventors need protection from big manufacturers and the so call invention marketing companies.

Presently, I've invented four other new product inventions of which I am afraid to disclose to any one. This is the era of high tech invention and it should not be riskful, but beneficial to the world, and in particular to the citizens of the United States of America.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Phillip Igbinadolor', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Phillip Igbinadolor, inventor

240-27 Caney Road
Rosedale, N.Y. 11422

January 27, 1999

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Director of Patent Examining Groups
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Petition for a Make Special (R-3) under the Infringement Provisions
In Re: Application Serial # 09/135,504 Filing Date: 06/22/98
Title: Integrated Car Dubbing System Inventor: Phillip Igbinadolor

Sir/Madam:

I respectfully wish to file this petition for a make special new application for a utility patent based on the infringement rules under CFR regulations and CFR 1.17(i) fee duly paid in money order.

ChR# 214

This petition, in part, provides answers of the verifiable statements of an actual infringement of my ideas and invention under the intellectual property rights provision act. Evidence of an infringement can be detected from the chronology of events, statements, and actions between me and the concerned parties relating to my invention at a given period of time.

My product invention consists of series of integrated technology and it is the first ever registered and patented car electronics that uses satellite, and or wireless technology with an applied software programming processes back by a special ICDS dual purpose disc. The distinctive nature of the new car sound system is its forty-two functional features detailed in my claim sheet for utility patent and prior arts claimed on my design patent. The electronic functional features of infringement in question are also technically and engineering detailed on all six pages of prior art works and drawings submitted for the design patent which were also filed with the utility patent application. The utility application of my invention is also practicable for home and commercial purposes.

I've attached a hard cover copy dated proof of my invention as disclosed long before any one or company knew of the ideas of infringement in question: Commercial Sensor break, internet/web in home/car/commercial electronics and personal computer adaptability in a car (my idea mainly eliminates bulky computer hardware and integrate it into an electronic cyber and entertainment surfing consumer product.

My idea and product invention were first disclosed to Mr. R. Ronaldo in 1995 and he was the first person to know of these ideas apart from me. Subsequent disclosure were made to Ms. Denise Benevento and later Mr. Algiers of Intellectual Property Group, a parent company of Above

the Board Drafting, Inc based in Florida.

Documents pertaining and relating to my invention and dates of disclosure are also submitted as proofs of my rights to prior arts. Unaware my ideas and invention are no longer confidential, I was told that the engineering company - Above the Board Drafting could not come up with a utility patent application as promised, even though detail and numerous pages of technical descriptions and drawings were sent. There was a breach of contract, however, the relevance of these verifiable statements is that both companies compromised, leaked, and perhaps sold my ideas to some manufacturing companies in the electronic industry. Chronology of events would help explain why I have concluded that an actual infringement of my ideas and invention had occurred.

In December, 1997, I saw on a QVC station (channel 79), a television station in New York that introduces and sells new products an idea in question PhilipsMagnavox had added to its existing product line. Also, in January, 1998 I noted that the same company has added a web feature on its existing television product line. A month later, on February 22, 1998 I also noted on the QVC station that JVC had added a commercial skip feature to its already existing vcr product. Just recently, I noted that Clarrion, an electronic manufacturer had added internet and pc in a car electronics. What do these companies have in common? They are feeding on my ideas which were disclosed in 1995. It doesn't take much to conclude that why didn't the companies featured these ideas before 1995 or before September 18, 1997 The reason is because I've been cheated out of my invention. I was told that the engeneering company - Above the Board Drafting could not come up with a utility patent application. They waited till I submit a foreed upon (go along with the design patent application or you loose your money) application before these manufacturers rush into making the ideas.

If they knew of the ideas before 1995 or 1997 why didn't they incorporate them sooner or file a patent claim as I have done. I've been granted a design patent on my invention on July 7, 1998. The utility patent application filed June 22, 1998 was done by me and it is the continuation version of the design patent # 395,884.

Your approval of this petition would help in considering my new application sooner and an hedge on the current industrial and intellectual espionage which is rampant in the United States and as a common practice worldwide. Small entity inventors need protection from big manufacturers and the so call invention marketing companies.

Presently, I've invented four other new product inventions of which I am afraid to disclose to any one. This is the era of high tech invention and it should not be riskful, but beneficial to the world, and in particular to the citizens of the United States of America.

Sincerely,



Phillip Igbinadolor, M.A., M.P.A., B.S.

Phillip Igbinadolor, inventor